

THE
COMMON SCHOOL JOURNAL.

NEW SERIES.

WM. B. FOWLE, EDITOR.

VOL. XII.

BOSTON, MARCH 15, 1850.

NO. 6.

THE DUTY OF GOVERNMENT
IN REGARD TO GENERAL EDUCATION.

[Continued from No. V.]

When thousands of children in the State neglect almost entirely the advantages offered by the public schools, it seems to be high time for the government to take some effectual measures to prevent such children from becoming pests or burthens to the community. We talk much about our liberty, and about the impossibility of *compelling* American freemen to send their children to school, but those who talk thus can have no correct ideas of liberty, or of the duty of a government. It is idle to prate about a government founded on reason, if so reasonable a thing as education can not be enforced. Nay further, it is gross injustice to tax those who have no children, to provide the means of educating the children of other men, and then not to oblige those children to use the means so provided. The chief argument for general taxation to support our free school system is based upon the protection that education gives to property and life, which protection is not given if the children are not educated.

Now this crying evil, which is the fruitful source of much of the pauperism, and vice, and crime, with which the community is cursed, and for which it is heavily taxed, under the head of almshouses, prisons, police courts and officers, armies and navies,—this crying evil is not alluded to by the worthy Governor in the message which has been the text of this, and of one or two preceding articles, nor is it alluded to in the New Report of the Board of Education. The Secretary in his Report makes a few remarks to show that the statements of

his predecessor were somewhat exaggerated, but he says nothing about remedial measures, unless the incidental remark, that truancy will never be effectually checked until teachers are what they ought to be, be an exception. Nothing can exceed the justice and truth of this remark, but our teachers are not what they ought to be, and are not likely to become so by the means now used; and the question arises, whether any thing can be done to compel the truants and neglected children to come into our schools. A great feast has been provided, and messages have been sent to the better classes, who, preferring private and more exclusive boards to the public table, have not generally come in. Then the poor and the maimed, the halt and the blind, that is, the destitute and unfortunate, have been invited, and such of them as could procure a decent garment, have accepted the invitation. But the house is not filled, and the lords of the feast seem to hesitate about their obligation to send into the highways and hedges, and *compel* the houseless, and vicious, and criminal to come in, and yet it is clear, that, until these do come in, and become the subjects of a kind and reformatory course of instruction, the feast is prepared in vain, and there is no security for the true progress and improvement of society.

When an infant is sick, and is reluctant to take the necessary antidote, the nurse generally compels it to receive and swallow the nauseous drug, because its recovery depends upon the draught, and it does not know what is for its own good. When a child loses his natural protectors, the court is bound to provide guardians to control the property and conduct of the orphan. When the child or adult is imbecile, the authorities compel him to submit to the guidance of others duly appointed. When the inebriate has lost the control of his appetite, the law can restrain him. When a neglected or destitute child resorts to theft or crime, even from urgent necessity, officers do not hesitate to seize, and prison doors to confine him. For nearly two hundred years, our fathers opened the church doors and compelled men to come in, although they neglected to provide in the same manner for the compulsory education of those children who were to make the church-neglecting men. If education is a blessing, it can be no wrong to compel those to receive it, who are to be blessed by it. If it be a safeguard, by which property is rendered more secure, and personal violence repressed, and enormous expenses prevented, society is without a motive, and government without an object, if education cannot be universally enforced.

But how long shall it be before something is done to secure to every child in the Commonwealth the benefits of instruc-

tion, as we secure to them the consequences of ignorance and neglect? Our new Secretary, under the sanction of the Board of Education, at the head of which is our excellent Governor, in his first Annual Report uses the following language. "A correct theory of popular education, and an organization of proper agencies for applying it, are indeed indispensable to any high degree of success. But they are only preliminaries. *The work itself, on which the whole value of the arrangement depends, is yet to be performed.* The same sound policy which originally induced the Board and its Secretary to begin at the foundation, and to advance in the work as fast, and as far, as circumstances would allow, now requires them, after twelve years successful labor, *to carry up the structure*, so as to exhibit its symmetrical form. At the outset, the danger most to be feared and avoided was that of going to work without due preparation. Now, the danger lies in the opposite direction, of leaving the work undone until every part of the preparation be completed." If we understand this, it means that the Board have laid a foundation, and it is time to go forward, but there is danger of still lingering longer in the preparatory part of the great work. We think so too, but what are we to conclude from the following remarks of the Secretary, which are made in the same paragraph with those just cited. "Since those to whom the State has entrusted the interests of education, are not, like architects, employed upon lifeless materials and shaping them at will for future use, but public servants, acting upon society and its institutions, it becomes necessary for them to study and to follow those laws which regulate the progress of society. These are slow, but steady in their operation. The public mind, no less than the individual mind, must, before committing itself to action, have time to ponder the subjects brought to its notice. Public measures, especially if they have an air of novelty, require to be brought, in some degree, to the test of experience, before they can command general confidence. *It is, consequently, more important to make a faithful trial of our present valuable though imperfect system of Public Schools, and thus to create a well merited confidence in its fundamental principles, than to aim chiefly at making further advances, either by legislation or otherwise, towards perfecting the system theoretically.* . . . Improvement in the administration of a system is often a surer mark of progress than improvement in the system itself."

Now, if we understand these words, especially those in italic, they are directly opposed to what we before quoted. After an experiment of the system for more than two hundred years, which is a considerable term, even in the life of a

nation, and a very considerable one in the life of an individual, we are told, first, that "*the whole* work is yet to be performed," that is, the whole work of "*carrying up the structure*," for which the Board and its Secretary had been twelve years and the community two hundred in laying a foundation. Then the danger lay in a bias, "to leave the work undone, until every part of the preparation be completed," and we seem to see a determination on the part of the new Secretary to rise, and do something meet for the times, but then we are told, that we must make a *faithful* trial of the old system, and "not aim to make further advances, either by legislation or otherwise, towards perfecting the system theoretically." "Turn ye," says the cautious Secretary, "Turn ye again to the weak and beggarly *elements* whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage." There seems to be little hope or chance for progress here, and the conclusion of the whole matter, "Improvement in the administration of a system is often a surer mark of progress than improvement in the system itself," if the people can be made to believe it, indicates that we are to go on as we have gone. But this can not be true; the improved administration of a bad or imperfect system is no sure mark of progress. It may deceive the people into an overestimate of the value of the system, it may conceal the defects, but it is never to be named in connection with a removal of the defects themselves.

Now what are the facts in regard to our Free School System? It was established two centuries ago, and went on until a few years ago, without any essential modification. Under the Board of Education, or rather under its Secretary,—for the Board had very little to do with the matter,—the system was better administered, and the defects concealed. But the defects remain, and the correction of them is the true "*carrying up of the structure*" to which the Secretary must bend his energies, if he wishes to make himself a name equal to that which his predecessor has obtained by twelve years' labor in the necessary work of preparation. David, the man of war was not allowed to build the temple, but he collected the materials; it being reserved for his wise and more peaceful successor "to carry up the structure." Let us hope that all the people will soon be called together to rejoice at its dedication.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR. DEARBORN.

The next Anglo-American Grammar to which our attention is called, was published by Benjamin Dearborn, at Boston, in 1795. The title is,

"The Columbian Grammar: or an Essay for reducing a grammatical knowledge of the English Language to a Degree of Simplicity which will render it easy for the Instructor to teach and for the pupil to learn. Accompanied with notes critical and explanatory. For the use of Schools and of Young Gentlemen and Ladies, Natives or Foreigners, who are desirous of attempting the Study without a Tutor. Being designed as part of a General System of Education in the most useful Branches of Literature, for American Youth of both Sexes. By Benjamin Dearborn, Member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Boston, Printed by Samuel Hall, for the Author, 1795. 12mo. pp. 140.

We have given the whole title page, because we believe the book is rarely seen, for it was probably published for the author, who in his will, above forty years afterwards, says he has "many copies of it on hand," not an unusual circumstance when authors publish on their own account. It is not probable that the Columbian Grammar was used out of the author's own school-room, for it never passed to a second edition, and yet it was much superior to many that were more popular. The author, in his preface, calls it "the fourth volume of the system mentioned in the title page," but the other volumes were never printed. In the same preface, the author shows his design, and points out the cause of all the trouble that teachers experience in teaching English Grammar. "Notwithstanding," he says, "the number of grammars already published, and the indefatigable labor of instructors in the use of them, it is yet *uncommon* to find persons possessed of a competent knowledge of our language for writing and speaking it correctly, who have not studied the grammar of the Latin or some foreign tongue. It has long since been proved that the English language is capable of being reduced to rules of grammatical accuracy; its state of dependence, therefore, can not be owing to its imbecility, but to some other cause. This cause the author supposes to exist principally in the want of a degree of simplicity in English Grammar, which would bring it to a level with the capacity of the higher classes of our youth at school, who are not designed for an academical education. To supply this deficiency, as far as the nature of the subject will permit, is the object of this publication."

The Grammar is by question and answer, as was Webster's

before it: The parts of speech are nine, the participle not being included. The noun has one person, the third; two numbers; three genders, and *four* cases, the *absolute* being the fourth.

To the pronoun, besides the four cases, the author allows two *states*, "which are used only in the possessive case." The *foregoing state* is that form of the pronoun which is placed before the noun; as, *my* book. The *following state* is that form which is placed after the noun; as, the book is *mine*, or, when the substantive is understood; as, *mine* is the best. No words are allowed to be pronouns but I, thou, he, she, it, who, and *none*, and *none* is classed with them, because, says our author; it is never used with a substantive, like an adjective." It is to be regretted that the words *no* and *one* were ever compounded, and still more that the compound should ever have been used in the plural number. "*None are so good as they ought to be*" is no better than, "*No one is so good as he ought to be,*" nor is the meaning altered by the introduction of this anomaly, which so disfigures our language. There is no more propriety in saying *none are* than in saying *nothing are*. But let us return to our author.

He despatched the *article* as Murray does, and then defined an Adjective to be "a word showing some quality, circumstance or *number* of a substantive, and yet he did not see that *a* and *an* must go with *one*, and *the* must go with *this* and *these*. Of course, he allows *case* and number, as well as comparison to adjectives, and he justly says, '*Each, every and either* are not always used according to the just meanings of the words; *each* meaning *every one* of any number; *every*, each one of all; *either*, whichever of two.'" "We have often condemned the use of *either* for *each* and *both*, but the usage of careless writers, backed by popular grammars, still authorizes a man to say that he has an ear on *either* side of his head, and a simpleton to say that when there are two sides to a question he does not ask which is right, but adopts *either* of them, and pleases both parties!

Our author divides verbs into active and neuter, "because the dictionaries do so, verbs active having an object after them, as, *try the pen*; verbs neuter having no object, as, *go to bed*; *breathe to live*"; as if *bed* and *live* were not as much the objects of *go* and *breathe*, as *pen* is the object of *try*!

His Verbs are varied by *time*, *number*, *person*, *style*, and *mode*. The numbers and persons are the same as in Murray; *style* is solemn or familiar; the *modes* are four in number, the *times* are three, *present*, *past* and *future*, no other names of *times* are given, but the *helping verbs* are mentioned, and the manner in which they are used explained, though

nothing is said of the tenses of which they are supposed to be signs. One note on this subject deserves to be quoted in this connection. Speaking of *tenses* or *times*, Mr. Dearborn says, "The drift of a sentence is the only guide for ascertaining the *time* in which it is expressed; for example, if, on a journey, I meet a friend who accosts me with, *Where are you going?* the answer is, "Home now, but *I am going into the country next week,*" the question being in the present time, and the answer in the future. Nothing is said of a *Potential* or *Subjunctive Mode*, but the *Conjunctive* is,

Past time,	If I were chosen.
Present time,	If I were choosing.
Future,	If I be chosen.

Nothing is said of a *passive voice*, though the passive form is also given in the three times. One peculiarity of the author is the natural order of his *times*, the *past* preceding the *present* in his paradigms.

The Imperative is allowed but one tense, and one person, the second. The *times* of the Infinitive mode are determined by the verbs with which the Infinitive is connected, thus,

Past,	I tried to choose.
Present,	I try to choose.
Future,	I shall try to choose.

In answer to the question, Does the Infinitive mode ever serve as an objective case? the author says, "Yes; as *He complains of having been sick*, where *having been sick* is used as an objective case."

Although Mr. Dearborn admitted a future tense and called *shall instruct* a verb, he has the following sensible note. "Some grammarians consider the words *is instructed*, a passive verb, while others deny the existence of such a verb. That two or more words should be combined to form one part of speech, is an idea contradictory to the first principles of grammar, whereby each word ranks as a part of speech independently. *The master has instructed the scholar*, *The scholar has been instructed by the master*; these phrases convey one and the same idea. In one the nominative *does* the the action and in the other receives it, and hence the author has a nominative active and a nominative passive, but does not consider the verb to be affected." The author then makes a remark which it would be well for later grammarians and writers to notice. "The difference between active and passive nominatives," says he, enables us to correct the common errors, *You are mistaken* for *you mistake*; *I am done* for *I have done*, &c. In a few instances, the nominative is made passive in the present time, as, *The house is building*, *The*

clothes are making." The author probably never heard of dreamed of the modern monstrosity "The house is being built," &c. In Boston it is common to see sign boards on which is printed "*Eating House.*" Can the lovers of the innovation inform us whether this means a house that *eats* or one that is *being eaten*?

The rules of Syntax are numerous, and a list of 200 words or sentences, ungrammatical, vulgar or mispronounced, end the volume.

Benjamin Dearborn, the author of the *Columbian Grammar*, which has now occupied our attention, was born at Portsmouth, N. H., and, we believe, educated at college, although he had not the vanity to affix the charmed A. M. to his name. He worked several years as a printer in his native town, before he opened a school there. He taught there ten years before he removed to Boston, where he was teaching a private school when he made his grammar. We remember him very well as a very eccentric, unattractive sort of man, not remarkable for refinement of manners. His inventive powers were very active, and the Patent Balance which bears his name, and which almost superseded the use of scales, enabled him to abandon his school, and, after many vicissitudes, to accumulate a snug fortune, although he wasted much money in other inventions that came to nought. Among these, was what he called his "*Lenient System*," which, if we remember aright, was a sort of factory, the great wheel of which was to be turned by destitute children, who were to run up stairs to the top of the wheel, and then to step upon a little platform connected with it and descend as their weight turned the wheel. The children were to be paid, and the invention was supposed so to mix the *utile* with the *dulci* as to form an irresistible attraction to children. Mr. Dearborn died in 1838, at the age of eighty one, and left an estate worth about ninety thousand dollars, which, after being used by one or two generations of his relatives, goes to the Boston Dispensary, a charitable institution for the relief of the sick and destitute poor.

Thus we have noticed all the Grammars published in this country previously to the introduction of Murray, if we except one published in 1782, at Hartford, Con., by Robert Ross, and one by J. Menye, at New York, in 1785, which are mentioned by Mr. Wm. H. Wells as in his collection, but which we have never seen. If they are American Grammars, and in the possession of any of our friends, we shall be grateful for the loan of them.

WALLIS.

THE LADY-MAID.—A DIALOGUE.

- [For the Common School Journal.]

GENTLEMAN AND LADY.

Gent. Is Miss Bartoon within?

Lady. (*Smiling at the question*) She is so, I believe.

G. Can I see her?

L. (*Looking at his spectacled eyes*) I think you can. What would you say to her through me?

G. You know her, then? Excuse the question, if it seem a strange one.

L. I know her? To be sure I do. But pray, why ask me such a question?

G. Because all tongues applaud her, and I fear, if all is true, that I have come in vain. Say, do you know her well?

L. I know her intimately, I must own.

G. Your—mistress, may I ask?

L. Why ——— y-e-s, I'm subject to her will.

G. She treats you well?

L. She is but too indulgent.

G. You love her then, of course.

L. Yes, as I do myself.

G. Say, is she fair?

L. Women are unsafe judges of each other.

G. How does your mistress with yourself compare? You surely will not overrate her now.

L. It is but faintest praise to say that, in my best estate, she never falls below me.

G. Good! And now one more strange question. Will she make me—— a good wife?

L. She could not say, not knowing how you judge; and how can I decide?

G. You know if she is engaged?

L. I think she is, (*smiling*) unusually so.

G. I mean, is she betrothed, or free?

L. I can not, sir, betray her secrets, till I know your motive for this singular inquest.

G. I'm searching for a wife.

L. She is not one, I'll answer you thus far.

G. I wish to make her mine.

L. She knows, sir, of your wish.

G. The deuce, she does! Who could have told her that?

L. Yourself.

G. 'Tis false!—Excuse me, miss, I never told my wish but to yourself.

- L.* I never could have told her ; yet she knows.
G. What thinks she of it, then ?
L. Of what ?
G. Of marriage.
L. Favorably of marriage in the abstract.
G. But what of marrying *me* ?
L. She must speak for herself.
G. Where can I see her without more delay ?
L. Here.
G. And when ?
L. Now.
G. How can I see her now, and she away ?
L. You can not.
G. Explain these paradoxes, or I shall go mad. Who are you, miss ? no servant, I am sure.
L. Yes, her servant, truly, though quite near of kin. 'Tis said that I resemble her in many points.
G. If she resembles you, I'll take her instantly.
L. Whether she will accept or not ? It may take two to make the bargain, Sir, unless you mean to give, and ask for no return.
G. If she refuses me, I'll marry you.
L. I should not take her leavings.
G. Then let her go. If you accept me first, I'm yours. What say you ?
L. But she too will accept, I know she will.
G. My bow then has two strings that cross each other.
L. Not so, exactly ; for the two may haply e'en be twisted into one.
G. These paradoxes craze my brain. You surely are not she I seek !
L. 'Tis now my turn to contradict, or to belie the truth.
G. Well twisted, by my faith ! And you will give me your free hand ?
L. Yes, both of them. This, for the servant ; for the mistress, this.
G. 'Tis gloriously done ! I'll wed the servant for herself, and take the mistress at the servant's word.

EDUCATION IN HYPOCRISY.—A lady called to her little boy, who was tossing marbles on the sidewalk, to come into the house.

"Don't you know you shouldn't be out there, my son ? Go into the back yard, if you want to play marbles,—it is Sunday."

"Ain't it Sunday in the back yard, too, mother ?" said the little urchin.

BROTHERHOOD.

[From the Practical Christian.]

Give me thy hand, my *shrinking* brother,
Wherefore dost thou doubting stand?
I'm a man, thou art another;
Give me then thy grasping hand.
Long and hard has been thy thrall,
Yet thou art a man for all.

Give me thy hand, my *wayward* brother,
Lift thy downcast eyes to heaven;
I'm a man, thou art another,
Turn to God, and be forgiven:
Hast thou wandered far away?
Look to Christ, he is the way.

Give me thy hand, my *haughty* brother,
Wherefore dost thou turn away?
I'm a man, thou art another;
What hast thou that I've not, pray?
A crown? Well, lust and pride make kings,
God never made so useless things.

Give me thy hand, my *wealthy* brother,
Wherefore now thy sidewise glance?
I'm a man, thou art another,—
All the difference is a chance;
Thy wealth is lent thee man to bless,
And wilt thou use it to oppress?

Give me thy hand, my *learned* brother,
Wherefore turn thy eyes aside?
I'm a man, thou art another,—
Is thy learning then thy pride?
Soul-riches God has given to thee
For his poor children,—make them free!

Give me thy hand, my *toiling* brother,
Hard thy labor, hard thy hand;
We are men that know each other,
Heart to heart we'll ever stand;
Manly is all useful labor,
He who shirks it hates his neighbor.

Give me thy hand, my *faithful* brother,
Battling nobly for the right;
We are men that know each other,
And we'll test the claims of might.
Onward, then, my faithful brother,
We are men that know each other.

Now join hands with one another,—
Hard hands, soft hands, black hands, white;
We're all men, we'll know each other,—
Let us join for truth and right.
God has made us all, my brother,
Let us love and bless each other.

Come, join all, of all the nations,
Christians, Heathens, Turks, and Jews,
All conditions, ranks, and stations,—
O let not a man refuse!
God loves each and all, my brother,
Let us love and bless each other.

PHYSIOLOGY NEGATIVELY APPLIED.

A foreign journal furnishes us with the following suggestions for the correction of well-known abuses.

If you want to have a thoroughly unhealthy bed-room, take the following precautions. Fasten a chimney-board against the fire-place, so as to prevent foul air from escaping in the night; and, of course, in the night season, never have a door or a window open. Use no perforated zinc in pannelling; especially avoid it in small bed-rooms. So you will get a room full of bad air. But in the same room there is bad, worse, and worst; and your object is to have the worst air possible. [Suffocating machines are made by every upholsterer; attach one to your bed; it is an apparatus of poles, rings, and curtains. By drawing your curtains around you before you sleep, you insure to yourself a condensed body of foul air over your person. This poison vapor-bath you will find to be most efficient when it is made of any thick material.] There being transpiration through the skin, it would not be a bad idea to see whether this cannot be, in some way, hindered. The popular method will do very well; smother the flesh as much as possible in feathers. A wandering princess, in some fairy tale, came to a king's house. The king's wife, with the curiosity and acuteness proper to her sex, wishing to ascertain whether their guest was truly born a princess, put three peas on the young lady's mattress, and over them a large feather bed, and then another, then another,—in fact, fifteen feather beds. Next morning the princess looked pale, and in answer to inquiries how she had passed the night, said that she had been unable to sleep at all, because the bed had lumps in it. The king's wife knew then that their guest was well bred. Take this highborn lady for a model. The feathers retain all heat about your body, and stifle the skin so far effectually that you awake in the morning pervaded by a sense of languor, which must be very agreeable to a person who has it in his mind to be unhealthy. In order to keep a check upon exhalation about your head (which otherwise might have too much the appearance of nature,) put on a stout, closely woven nightcap. People who are at the height of cleverness in this respect,

sleep with their heads under the bed-clothes. Take no rest on a hair mattress; it is elastic and pleasant, certainly, but it does not encase the body; and therefore, you run a risk of not awaking languid. Never wash when you go to bed; you are not going to see any body, and, therefore, there is no use in washing. In the morning wet no more skin than you absolutely must, that is to say, no more than your neighbors will see during the day,—the face and hands. So much you may do with a tolerably good will, since it is the other part of the surface of the body, more covered and more impeded in the full discharge of its functions, which has rather the more need of ablution. It is, therefore, fortunate that you can leave that other part unwashed. Five minutes of sponging and rubbing over the whole body in the morning would tend to invigorate the system, and would send you with a cheerful glow to the day's business or pleasure. Avoid it by all means, if you desire to be unhealthy. Do not forget that although you must, unfortunately, apply water to your face, you can find warrant, in custom, to excuse you from annoying it with soap; and for the water again you are at liberty to obtain compensation damages out of that part of the head which the hair covers. Never wash it; clog it with oil or lard,—either of which will answer your purpose, as either will keep out air as well as water, and promote the growth of a thick morion of scurf. Lard in the bed-room is called bear's grease. In connexion with its virtues in promoting growth of hair, there is a tale, which I believe to be no fiction, like that of the old and profane jest of the man who rubbed a pine box with it over night, and found a hair trunk in the morning. It is said that the first adventurer who advertised bear's grease for sale appended to the laudation of its efficacy a *nota bene*, that gentlemen, after applying it, should wash the palms of their hands, otherwise the hair would sprout thence also. I admire that speculator,—grimly satiric at the expense both of himself and of his customers. He jested at his own pretensions, and declared, by an oblique hint, that he did not look for friends among the scrupulously clean! Of course, as you do not cleanse your body daily, so you will not show favor to your feet. Keep up a due distinction between the upper and lower members. When Lady Wortley Montague was told confidently that she had dirty hands, she replied, with the liveliness of conscious triumph, "Ah, do you call that dirty? You should see my toes!" Some people wash them once in every month,—that will do very well; or once a year, it matters little which. In what washing you find yourself unable to omit, use only the finest towels, those which inflict the least friction on the skin.

Having made these arrangements for yourself, take care that they are adhered to, so far as may be convenient throughout your household. Here and there put numerous sleepers into a single room; this is a good thing for children, when you wish to blanch them, and render them delicate; but you must not carry this too far, otherwise you will make them resemble factory operatives. By all means let a baby have foul air, not only by the use of suffocating apparatus, but by causing it to sleep where there are four or five others, in a well-closed room. So much is due to the maintenance of our orthodox rate of infant mortality.

PUNCTUATION. NO. V.

In our previous numbers we have treated chiefly of the simple *pauses*, and we now come to two marks, which not only indicate a pause, but, by giving a clue to the character of the sentence, enable the reader to give the proper expression of voice that is required. These compound marks are the *Interrogation* and *Exclamation points*. The common rule is, that these marks uniformly require the same pause as a period, but the truth is, that they represent the comma, semicolon and colon as often as they do the period. It is to be regretted that, in this respect, these important marks are left so indefinite, for few children have judgment enough to determine the length of the pause they represent. We see no reason why a slight change of form may not secure both ends, and we propose for the consideration of teachers the following modifications. For a question or exclamation requiring the pause of a period, the common form is sufficient (?!). For the comma pause, (?!). For the semicolon, (?!;), and for the colon pause (?!:). Examples;

Who did it ? John? or James? or William? Neither ! say you ?

What ! do you deny the charge ? O monstrous impudence ! Begone !

Of course, we do not expect our suggestion to be adopted by the printers and bookmakers, but we trust that many a faithful teacher will take his children to the Blackboard, and require them to exercise their judgment by making the points as here proposed, and we shall have effected our object, if we call the attention of teachers to the fact that the Exclamation and Interrogation points represent not one of the pauses only, but all of them.

Attention to this fact will sometimes enable the reader to regulate the inflections of the voice required by the sense, but

other rules are necessary, and as these have more to do with rhetoric than with punctuation, we shall only give a very comprehensive rule for the regulation of the voice at the Interrogation point. If the question can be answered by *yes* or *no*, the voice generally takes the upward inflection, and when it can not be so answered, the downward inflection will in most cases be the true one. Nothing can be more incorrect than the remark of Dr. Lowth, adopted by Dr. Webster, that "The Interrogation and Exclamation points mark an *elevation* of the voice."

If the Exclamation and Interrogation points do not always represent the period, an important question arises as to the propriety of always using a capital letter after them, as is the general practice. There can be no doubt, we think, that the practice is wrong, and that these marks should be followed by the same letter that would follow the pause they represent.

It is not uncommon for the common pauses to be substituted for the Interrogation mark, when several occur in a sentence, and, in such cases, the last only has the true mark. Thus in Romans viii. 35, it is said, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?"

We have had occasion before to regret the incorrect punctuation of the Scriptures, and we can not forbear, in this connection, to point out a remarkable case, in which the force of a passage is destroyed by the injudicious supply of words not needed, and by the improper punctuation resulting from the perverted sense. The two verses that precede the verse just cited, read thus, the words in italic being inserted by the translators.

v. 33. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? *It is* God that justifieth.

v. 34. Who is he that condemneth? *It is* Christ that died, &c.

Is it would be far preferable to *it is*; but, omitting the words *it is*, supplied by the translators, the passage will read thus. "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? God, that justifieth?—Who is he that condemneth? Christ, that died?—Had the translators supplied the word *shall* instead of *it is* in v. 33 and 34, as they did in v. 35, the sense would have been clear, and the punctuation easily determined. It would not be wrong, if *shall* is omitted, to place the Exclamation point after *justifieth, died, tribulation, &c.*, to express surprise at the absurdity of the supposed answer.

In using the Interrogation point, we must be careful not to include in the question what is no part of it. Thus, instead of saying, "Is it just, said the stranger?" we should say, "Is it just?" said the stranger.

Again we must be careful not to mark as a question, what is merely related without any expectation of receiving an answer, as in the following sentences. "Mentor then asked Idomeneus how Protesilaüs conducted under the change of circumstances." "What is more amiable than filial piety!"

So the Exclamation point must be placed after the entire exclamation, even though an interjection be part of it. Thus we should say,

"O, how I pity you!" and not, "O! how I pity you."

"Alas, how early dead!" and not, "Alas! how early dead."

[To be continued.]

EXCERPTA CORRIGENDA.

A criminal at the bar may be defended by only less great a criminal out of it. *London Examiner*. (By a criminal, only less great, out of it.)

It is fit that certain questions should be met, and not be suffered to *let drop* till the answer is given. *London Examiner*. (Not be suffered to drop.)

I am going *into* my trunk. (to)

We are *into* a suit of those clothes. (in)

The last two are Virginia expressions. In this region the difference between *in* and *into* is not sufficiently regarded. When we are going *into* the water, we are advancing towards it, but when we are going *in* the water, we are moving in it, enveloped, more or less, by it. A man goes *into* a coach when he enters it; he goes *in* a coach after he has entered it.

Dr. Webster, in the Preface to his great Dictionary, says, "Our language will be spoken by more people in this country than any language on earth, except the Chinese." [Here *people* are compared with *language*. One way of correcting the expression is the following;—"Our language will be spoken by more *persons* in this country than *now speak* any *other* language on earth, except that of China.]

In the same Preface, we have the following sentence, "A life devoted to reading our vernacular language, and, especially, a particular examination of our best writers, with a view to a comparison of their style and phraseology with those of American writers, and with our colloquial usage, *enables* me to affirm, &c."

☞ All Communications, Newspapers, and Periodicals, for the Journal, should be addressed to Wm. B. Fowle, Editor, West Newton.

THE COMMON SCHOOL JOURNAL is regularly published, semi-monthly by LEMUEL N. IDE, 138½ Washington street, up stairs, (opposite School-street,) Boston. ☞ Price, One Dollar a year, payable in advance, or \$1.25, if not paid before April 1. ☞ ☞